[8th September 1928

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" Is the hon. Revenue Member satisfied that they are actually doing any work at all ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I have already answered, Sir."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, the answer to clause (c) simply refers to the order of His Excellency the Governor. I want to know as a matter of fact whether they are part-time or whole-time servants and whether they are allowed to do any other remunerative work."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I do not propose to add anything to the answer, Sir."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, I seek your protection. The order of His Excellency only says that it does not forbid them to do other remunerative work. Reference to that order does not answer my question fully. Part of my question was, 'if so why they are permitted to do other remunerative work ? ' Government may say, 'We do not propose to answer the question.' But I am entitled to an answer from the Government as to why they are allowed to be part-time Government servants."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The answer is that the order of His Excellency does not forbid them. It may perhaps be in order if the hon. Member puts a question as to what advice the Government gave to His Excellency regarding the duties of Council Secretaries and also as to whether they should be whole-time or part-time Government servants."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I accept the suggestion, Sir. May I ask the Government what advice they gave to His Excellency the Governor in this matter and if they advised him that the Council Secretaries might be part-time servants, why they gave that advice ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Notice, Sir."

Revenue offices

Abolition of search fees for public documents.

*288 Q.—Mr. A. PARASURAMA RAO : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state : with reference to answer to question No. 1712, dated 14th March 1928, whether the Government have decided to abolish the levy of search fees in connexion with the applications for copies of public documents ?

A.—As far as Revenue offices are concerned, the answer is in the negative, as the decision of the High Court in LIV, Madras Law Journal, relates only to the application for copies of certain orders under the Estates Land Act I of 1908.

Arms and Explosives

Issue of licences under the Arms Act.

*289 Q.—Mr. A. PARASURAMA RAO : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether before applications for licences under the Arms Act are refused by District Magistrates, the applicants are informed of the reasons for such refusal and asked to show cause why their applications should not be refused ; and

8th September 1928]

(*b*) whether the Government have laid down any principles for the guidance of District Magistrates in granting or refusing licence; if not, whether they will be pleased to do so?

A.—(*a*) District Magistrates are not bound to assign reasons for the refusal of licences. The Government have no information whether in actual practice the precise procedure indicated in the question is followed.

(*b*) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the Resolution of the Government of India, Home Department (Police), dated 3rd November 1923, No. 829-1-23, published at pages 1340—1343 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 27th November 1923.

Mr. A. Parasurama Rao :—"May I know why the District Magistrate is not bound to give reasons for his refusal of licence?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur :—"There may be confidential reasons."

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao :—"At whose instance are the orders passed?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur :—"The application is made by a private party and an enquiry is then made by the District Magistrate and he passes the order."

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao :—"Are the Police consulted in the matter?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur :—"Sometimes they are consulted."

Criminal Justice

Alleged order of externment against Messrs. Giri, Joshi and others while at Negapatam.

* 290 Q.—Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. Ponnuswami Pillai, Deputy Magistrate, Negapatam, recently passed an order of externment against Messrs. Giri, Joshi and others when they visited Negapatam on 8th August 1928 to enquire into the grievances of the South Indian Railway employees;

(*b*) whether Government will be pleased to call for the information furnished to the Deputy Magistrate by the Police and lay the same on the table of this House; and

(*c*) whether the Police asked for an order from the Deputy Magistrate prohibiting public meetings in Negapatam and surrounding villages; and if so, on what grounds?

A.—(*a*) The Magistrate issued an order directing Messrs. N. S. Ramaswami Ayyangar, Giri and Joshi to leave Negapatam and not to return to that place for two months.

(*b*) This order was not issued at the instance of the Police.

(*c*) Yes; because it was considered that in the conditions which existed in the locality at that time, the holding of such meetings was likely to cause a breach of peace.